

acter of Henry the Eighth and Queen Bess; they must agree to differ as to what sort of a place heaven is and what denominations of Christians are excluded from it, and recognize that in this practical world at all events both orthodox believers and heretics may blend their enterprise, capital and labor for worldly purposes without endangering their spiritual interests. Prosperity in any country must depend upon freedom to use the land and a disposition to use it. The recent Act gives the Irish people the former in a qualified sense at least; the latter element the people must supply themselves. The Irishman is not afraid of hard work nor is he deficient in intellectual qualities, as no American reader needs to be told, but in thrift, perseverance and general level-headedness he is hardly the equal of the Scotchman or Englishman. But it would be strange if, having lived for centuries under a land system whereby he had nothing to gain from his own industry, he did not suffer from defects of character. The measure of local self-government which Ireland now enjoys may be expected to deepen Irishmen's sense of responsibility and a national Parliament in College Green would doubtless do more in that direction. But while there is agitation there cannot be prosperity. Agitation stops the investment of capital and compels labor to work at the line of least advantage. It operates like a war upon a nation's credit, making it impossible to borrow money for public enterprises except at a high rate of interest. It will be a happy day for Ireland when she can afford to dismiss her agitators and settle down to the task which Dr. Johnson declared to be one of the most innocent ones in which a man can be employed—that of making money.

## THE COMMUNITY OF HUMAN INTERESTS.

(For the Review.)

By L. H. BERENS.

"No less comprehensive idea than that of the community of human interests can be made the basis of civilization."—William Clarke in *Contemporary Review*, January, 1899.

The profound truth of the above words will be readily admitted by those whose political thought is illumined and directed by what is known as the Single Tax philosophy. Yet if they glance at the facts of existing social life they are forced to admit that the community of human interests, if it really exist, is to-day abundantly hidden from the ken of the superficial observer, of the much-talked-of "man in the street." Mutual struggle, not mutual aid; conflict, not community; bitter strife, not harmonious co-operation, seems the predominant factor in the civilization of to-day, in the halting, stunted, incomplete civilization, the burden of which falls so crushingly on those least able to bear it. Within each separate community one sees signs of a continuous, degrading, brutal and apparently permanent struggle between the masses of mankind for a mere existence—a struggle not between man and nature, but between man and man; each man's hand uplifted against his neighbor; each seemingly isolated and unrelated, fighting his own individual battle, or, at best, that of his own class, caste, nation or race.

The established politics of the various nations, as revealed in their

domestic and foreign legislation, also fails to indicate the acceptance of any belief in the community of human interests. Quite the contrary. They are quite manifestly based on the assumption that the interests of the different individuals and classes of individuals within the nation, as those of each separate community, are necessarily opposed and conflicting. Nationalism, Imperialism, Militarism, Conquest, Empire, Fortified Frontiers, Standing Armies, ever-increasing navies, Yellow, White and Black "Perils," and, above all, Exclusion or Alien Bills, and "Protective" Tariffs; such are the typical fruits of this political standpoint. Cosmopolitanism, Home Rule and Federation, Peace and International Good-will, Justice and Toleration, and, above all, Free Trade, the free and unfettered interchange of services and commodities; such would be the typical fruits of national politics based on the universal acceptance of the necessary community of human interests.

But a hundred years ago, thanks to the great thought-movement we owe to France and the United States of America, it almost seemed as if the recognition of the necessary community of human interests had conquered for itself a permanent place in the minds of the thoughtful of the world. Liberty, Equality and Fraternity—or Freedom, Justice and Brotherhood—seemed inscribed on the banners of humanity never again to be effaced. Since then, however, the forces of reaction have rallied, and the old-time view, of the necessarily conflicting and opposing interests of each separate community, has gradually resumed its predominant supremacy in the minds of the masses of mankind. The foreigner, there is your enemy; this is the thought carefully and persistently instilled into the minds of the people of every nation by the privileged, predatory classes who rule over them and batten on their ignorance. With the result that the nations of Europe have been transformed into camps of armed men, men ready and willing, under the sanction of patriotism, and with the approval of the established churches, to spring at the throats of their brother-men in defence or in pursuit of national interests tacitly assumed to be naturally opposed to those of all other nations. Whilst towards the weaker, or "inferior," races and people their actions have been consistently such as to justify a great French publicist recently to declare that "they know of us only by our crimes."

To-day the highly cultured minds of the very superior people, whether strenuous or blasé, who play such a prominent part in modern politics, Justice and Liberty are quietly dismissed as vain illusions, or to be talked of only on public platforms with tongue in cheek. Equality is misinterpreted and rejected as an undesirable impossibility; whilst Fraternity is smiled at as an idle dream, and any contention of the necessity for the community of human interests being made the basis of civilization, if it is to endure, would be curtly dismissed as opposed to the facts of nature. And the average man, upon whose support they depend, would loudly applaud their verdict.

Under such circumstances it may be well briefly to reconsider the whole question, with the view of discovering which view is really in accordance with the facts, and which, therefore, is the more likely to afford a safe foundation for our political reasoning, for our political faith. To this end let us briefly inquire into the causes constantly impelling mankind to activity and to enter into social relations with their fellow-men.

Reason and universal experience alike teach us that men work in order to enjoy, in order to satisfy their wants, to minister to their desires, whatever these may be. Without work, without exertion of some sort, wants

cannot be satisfied, desires cannot be gratified. Self-preservation, as we are so often reminded, is the first law of Nature; and self-preservation constantly impels men to activity, to draw the means of maintaining life from its natural sources, or to obtain it from their fellow-men. Moreover of two or more ways of attaining a desired end, man, as indeed all other animals, naturally and inevitably select the one by which they deem it may be achieved at the lowest cost of labor, of pain, exertion or discomfort—in other words, their tendency is always to activity on the line of least resistance, or, what is equivalent, of greatest attraction. Individually, man is one of the most helpless, in association with his fellows he is the most powerful of all existing beings. Hence it is that self-preservation, as well as race-preservation, constantly impels man to enter into social relations with his fellows, to live a social life.

In short, it is because their own individual desires can be thus more easily and more thoroughly gratified that men constantly seek to enter into some sort of social relations with others, even with those of different habits, customs or color. On the overwhelming advantages of co-operation and division of labor, it should be unnecessary for us to dilate. Co-operation involves division of labor; and division of labor involves co-operation. And manifestly without some form of social life, or social union, however rudimentary, co-operation and division of labor are alike impossible. The animating principle, or hidden mainspring, of co-operation, of social life, is the reciprocal exchange of services; the individual rendering services, direct or indirect, to others on the understanding, implied or expressed, that he is thereby to be able to command counter-services from others. Moreover, we should do well to remember that trade, or the exchange of commodities, is but an extension of this reciprocal exchange of services beyond the more or less arbitrary limits of the factory, community or country.

Manifestly some accepted rule of conduct, some accepted basis of association, implicit or expressed, enforced or inherited, is a necessary condition of association and co-operation, of social relations, whether as between the individuals of the same community, or as between different co-operating communities. Before a man can live and work with others, he must know what he may expect from them, and what they expect from him. Even the slave, the victim of the crudest and most brutal form of social union ever enforced by man on man, knew this; and his knowledge determined not only his actions, but also his character. For free co-operation, or peaceful voluntary association, this is preeminently necessary. As the late Professor Huxley well expressed it: "Society is impossible unless those who are associated agree to observe certain rules of conduct towards one another." And our immediate object is to ascertain on what principle any such rules of conduct—to-day crystallized into customs, laws and institutions—should be based. Practically, the choice of mankind is very limited. There are, in fact, but two alternatives. Either they must agree to recognize the equal claims of all to life, and frame their customs, laws and institutions in accordance therewith; or they must agree to recognize the special claims of some, and frame their customs, laws and institutions in accordance therewith. In other words, they must accept Justice, or must accept Privilege, as the basis, the corner-stone, as well as the test and touch-stone, of their social customs, laws and institutions.

Some acceptance of Justice, some recognition of the claims of others, however rudimentary and incomplete, is obviously a necessary pre-condition of association, of social life. It required no Divine voice from Heaven

to teach mankind: Thou shalt not kill; thou shalt not steal. Though mankind has always found it and still finds it difficult, if not impossible, strictly to obey them, these two great and fundamental social commandments are but the practical expression of the most primitive demands of Justice, of the most elementary recognition of the claims of others. And social progress, as well as moral progress, simply consists of the broadening conceptions and stricter obedience to these two basic social laws, and the alterations of our social customs and institutions in accordance therewith. For, in truth, as Henry George well expresses it: "The advances in which civilization consists are not secured in the constitution of man, but in the constitution of society."

To use the words of Charles Darwin: "The moral sense is fundamentally identical with the social instinct." The sense of duty, of responsibility, of right and of wrong, in the ethical or social sense, as well as of justice—in short, everything that makes up the soul of man owes its origin to and is developed by the exigencies and necessities of social life. With the development of social the moral sense develops and becomes more imperative in its demands, as does the necessity to obey its promptings. Hence the continuous struggle between the supporters of things as they are and those who would fain see things altered in accordance with the higher aspiration of the human mind, in accordance with what the soul, the social conscience, of man tells him is just and right. Whatever is just is necessarily right. For, as Aristotle expressed it many, many years ago: "Justice is the social virtue and the very criterion of what is right."

It promises well for the future of mankind, for the possibility of the advent of a universal civilization based upon Justice, as well as upon the community of human interests, that the more advanced and progressive nations of western Europe and America have already accepted Justice, or the recognition of the equal claims of all to life, to liberty and the pursuit of happiness, as the basis of their social structure. True, such acceptance is as yet but in the abstract only, a sort of confession of faith to which there is little or no attempt to conform their individual and social activities. This is manifestly insufficient. To reap the fruits of Justice, to which they now render mere lip-service, they must strenuously strive to ascertain what Justice demands, what Justice involves, and to shape their social laws and institutions, their social as well as their individual activities, in accordance therewith. And whatever else it may require, it is fairly self-evident that the first demand of Justice is that the social structure shall be based and the laws and institutions that determine the social relations of their own citizens shall be framed, on the recognition of the equal claims of all to Nature, to the use of the land, without the use of which life cannot be maintained. Thus and thus alone can the first steps towards the reign of Justice be taken. Thus and thus alone can we commence to render complete obedience to the two, time-honored, social commandments: "Thou shalt not kill;" "Thou shalt not steal."

It is to this ignoring of the dictates of Justice that the present anarchic struggle for existence within each separate "civilized" community can be traced. It is this denial of Justice that causes the people of the world to regard their interests as necessarily opposing and conflicting, which hides the true community of human interests from their ken, and which is the direct and mediate cause of all internecine strife, of almost all international wars and struggles. When the people of each separate community learn to respect the equal claims to life, of their fellow-citi-

zens, they will also come to respect the claims of others of different communities, of countries, religion or race. There is room in this world for us all, even though our numbers were increased tenfold. It is the prevailing social injustice within each community that separates man from man, nation from nation, which fills the hearts of men with bitterness and vile passions, the world with misery and strife. And yet in the nature of things the interests of mankind are harmonious, not conflicting; there is a true and permanent community of human interests, which the prevailing social injustice alone prevents becoming manifest to the minds of men.

The duty of those who realize this is obvious. They must work for the recognition and realization of Justice as the test and touch-stone of the relations of men within each separate community, as of the international relations of the various communities, countries and races. Thus, and thus alone, will the community of human interests become manifest and arise from under the clouds of suspicion, prejudice, and intolerance and injustice which now hides it from our view. The time has come. The world is ripe, rotten ripe, for change. For, to close with the burning words of Henry George:

"In our times, as in times before, creep on the insidious forces that, producing inequality, destroy Liberty. On the horizon the clouds begin to lower. Liberty calls to us once again. We must follow her further; we must trust her fully. Either we must wholly accept her or she will not stay. It is not enough that men should vote; it is not enough that they should be theoretically equal before the law. They must have Liberty to avail themselves of the opportunities and means of life; they must stand on equal terms with reference to the bounties of Nature. Either this, or Liberty withdraws her light! Either this, or darkness comes on, and the very forces that progress has evolved turn to powers that work destruction. This is the universal law. This is the lesson of the centuries. Unless its foundations be laid in Justice, the social structure cannot stand."

London, England.

---

## THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE VINDICATED.

*(For the Review.)*

By J. W. BENGOUGH.

There are some people in the United States who take the position more or less openly that the Declaration of Independence is an out-worn document; that whatever its practical merits may once have been, it is now no more than a cherished relic having certain spectacular uses on Fourth-of-July occasions. There are other Americans—constituting the vast majority—who regard such sentiments as savoring of blasphemy, but who, nevertheless, are ardent supporters of the prevailing policy of Protection. The real difference between these two classes of citizens is merely this: That the one consciously repudiates the Declaration, and the other virtually does so.

The fundamental doctrine of the Declaration is that "All men are endowed with certain inalienable rights, amongst which are life, liberty